

REPORT OF SITE FINDINGS

**Arizona State University
April 22-24, 2007**

Review Team Members

Lisa Kelley, Chairperson, National Board Certified Teacher

Patty Hardy, Arizona Department of Education

Linda Thieken, Arizona Education Association

Dr. Cindy Knott, Private Institution of Higher Education

Dr. Bobbie Sferra, Community College

Dr. Sherry Markel, State Institution of Higher Education

Vivian Martinez, K-12 Administration



**Arizona Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007**

INTRODUCTION

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for Arizona State University was conducted on April 22-24. The following programs were submitted for review:

1. Apprentice Teacher Preparation Program (BAE in Elementary Education)
2. Dine Teacher Preparation Program (BAE in Elementary Education)
3. Early Childhood Education Teacher Preparation program (BAE in Early Childhood)
4. Elementary Education Partnership Program (BAE in Elementary Education)
5. Indigenous Teacher Preparation Program (BAE in Elementary Education)
6. Integrated Certification in Teacher Education (BAE in Elementary Education)
7. Multilingual/Multicultural concentration Program (BAE in Elementary Education)
8. Secondary Education Program (degree granted from the College of Fine Arts)
9. Secondary Art Education
10. Secondary Dance Education
11. Secondary Music Education
12. Secondary Theatre Education
13. Special Education Program
14. Special Education Post-Bac Program
15. Special Education /Elementary Education Dual Certification
16. Teacher Education and Certification Highway (Teach+ME) Post-baccalaureate
17. Teacher Education and Certification Highway- Early Childhood (Teach+ME) Post Baccalaureate
18. Teacher Education for Arizona Mathematics and Science (Secondary Education)

19. Division of Educational Leadership (Master of Education Administration)
 1. Principal Certificate
 2. Superintendent Certificate
 3. Supervisor Certificate
20. Division of Psychology in Education
 1. School Counseling (Master of Counseling, School Counseling (K-12))
 2. School Psychology (APA National Accreditation)

The review team expresses its appreciation to the faculty for their work in preparation for the visit. The faculty and staff were very cooperative with the team throughout the visit. The team further expresses appreciation for the hospitality shown them on the Arizona State University campus.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. The on-site visits are an important part of that process. Following are the findings of the review team along with the list of exhibits and interviews used for reaching the conclusions.

PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS (COMMON THREADS)

Commendations:

- ASU administration and staff are to be commended for participating in the Teachers for a New Era initiative.
- Collaboration between the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences .
- Designation of content area staff to collaborate with the secondary education program staff .
- Communication and collaboration facilitated by the ITC Counsel .
- Strong Academic Advisement.
- Quality of teacher preparation instructors.
- Diversity of programs that create flexibility for students.
- Extensive community partnerships that promote President Crowe's vision.
- Field experience(s) are an integral part of all programs and hailed by students and faculty alike.
- Action Research is a component of College of Education programs. This clinical research is used to improve programs and has an impact beyond the College of Education.
- Based on interviews with students, LEA administration and faculty, the programs offered are much stronger than evidenced by the documentation provided to the review team.
- Support for students experiencing difficulty and their supervising teachers is readily available from the Field Experience Office.
- All students have access to counseling services.
- Taskstream is currently used by all student teachers within the College of Education.

Challenges:

- Key leadership positions are interim.
- Supervision of candidates during field experiences varies by program and the requirements are extremely loose. This goes across ALL academic programs.
- Huge discrepancy between what field experience office is stating about field experience placements and what candidates are expressing (e.g. students are being placed with first year teachers during their practicum experiences). Interviews with candidates provided evidence that the field experiences were essential to their learning. However, they had grave concerns about the quality of the mentor teachers (e.g. negative attitudes toward the profession).
- Taskstream needs to be expanded across programs. Usage is excellent by the Elementary Education Partnership Programs, but not the other programs within the College of Education.
- Instructors are experiencing difficulties with students' lack of writing skills. Instructors do not see competency with many students after they "pass" English 101/102. Data does not support that students are being screened for writing. No one appears to be deficient in the area of writing as they are being admitted.
- Lack of master syllabi templates with standard language.
- Identification of benchmark assignments that assess student's competency in meeting state and national standards varies by program.
- Lack of rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements that clearly evaluate a candidate's competency in meeting coursework objectives/competencies and state and national standards varies by program.
- The evaluation instrument used by placement teachers seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important placement teachers also need to be evaluating the intern's ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Apprentice Teacher Education Program (ATP)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Apprentice Teacher Program (ATP) is an immersion K-8 certification program that is completed in one calendar year, January through December, with all coursework based in the participating schools. The theoretical premises that support the ATP program might be called “practice informed by theory” as students are immersed in both “school” and “teacher” cultures throughout their program. In order to fulfill all the requirements of ATP, we adhere to the school district calendar and not the ASU calendar.

ATP students are immersed in the “school culture” and interact with teachers and children on a daily basis. Most facets of the ATP program – including all the ASU methods courses and all the ATP students’ interactions with the teachers and K-6 students – take place in public schools in the Tempe School District and the Gilbert Unified School District. ATP currently has a cohort of 28 students in the Tempe School District who will complete the entire program while working in K-6 classrooms within our partnering schools.

Practicing classroom teachers play prominent roles across all facets of the ATP program. K-6 teachers either teach or co-teach more than half of the ASU courses in the ATP program, including all the practica and nearly all of the methods courses. During their first semester, ATP students have classes all day on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and on Tuesday and Thursdays they spend all day in their internship. ATP students log 10 full days in each of three different classrooms – at three different grade levels – in three different schools. Practicing classroom teachers structure these experiences and provide feedback to ATP students throughout their experience.

During our eight-week summer program, the ATP students plan lessons and teach for five weeks, from 8-noon, Monday thru Friday, in a program designed for K-5 students from the Tempe School District. During this time classroom teachers act as “apprentices” and mentor the ATP students over the summer. The mentor teachers model lessons, observe lessons presented by the ATP students and provide feedback to the students. In the afternoons in the summer and on a few Saturdays, the ATP students attend their courses on-site at Holdeman Elementary School.

In the fall, the ATP students complete the program by student teaching full time for 19 weeks.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other.

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. EED 478 is also used in other elementary education programs.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in all syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Very few syllabi clearly identified the benchmark/signature assignment. It was difficult to identify specifically which assignment was a benchmark assignment without looking at the program matrix.

Competencies in some syllabi were weak and not clearly identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Align coursework to National Standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. There were few rubrics presented that were used to evaluate assignments.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix however; syllabi did not identify those assignments as benchmark/signature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark/signature assignments through the syllabi so that there is alignment to the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were few rubrics available for review associated with any assignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics for them.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's internships. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The intern placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with internships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Very few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes are dispositional in nature.

There was no correlation to the evaluation and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Align evaluation instrument with national standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during weeks 1-5 in student teaching but the other expectations were not evident or available

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured but there is no evidence that it is aligned to national standards.

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers is aligned to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes are dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Field experience is built into coursework. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each session. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on experience in low SES schools, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

Students expressed satisfaction with the program.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Dine Teacher Education Program

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Dine Teacher Education Program is a 2 +2 program designed with the College of Education to provide instruction and learning onsite at Dine College in Tsaile, AZ

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. BLE 478 is also used in the Indigenous Teacher Prep Program.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads (3)

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in any syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Only two syllabi were provided for review. Additional syllabi were supposed to be available on the website however the team was unable to follow the majority of the links to the course syllabi. Several were not available for review.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics (lack thereof)

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

Provide syllabi for all courses in the course sequence. *All course syllabi must be submitted within 30 days of State Board approval.*

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. There was no rubric presented that was used to evaluate any assignment.

Alignment to program matrix was difficult to determine. There was no evidence that any part of the program was evaluated during field experience.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were rubrics available for review associated with several assignments. There was no consistent format in the creation of the rubrics
Benchmark assignments were not identified from any other assignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's apprenticeship. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The apprenticeship placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with apprenticeships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with Dine staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluations of students in the apprenticeship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

There is evidence of an evaluation instrument for the apprenticeships however; evaluation is centered on dispositions rather than performance in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluations of students in the apprenticeship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during student teaching.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents
- Website

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is thorough and well structured but there is not evident that it is tied to national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Three years worth of data was provided with regard to AEPA scores however; it does not seem that the Dine Program itself has the data but that the data provided is an overview of ASU as a whole.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines, and person responsible.

See specific program recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The program has a set of core courses in the four blocks of the program. The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other block by block.

Field experience is built into blocks I, II, and III. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each block. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on ELL education, particularly with regard to Navajo language and culture, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

The program is administered by enthusiastic staff who are eager to serve their particular population and were available for interviews and questions on the day of the site visit.

The guide for AEPA writing practice assignment is a good resource for preparing students for success.

Course syllabi that show embedded apprenticeship expectations were particularly useful.

There are serious concerns over the copyright dates of the textbook selections for the courses. While some material continues to be best practices; a suggestion would be to find it in more recent publications. One text had a copyright of 1986.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Early Childhood Teacher Prep Program (BAE) Early Childhood

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Program (BAE) prepares educators who wish to teach children in infant/toddler programs, or in preschool through third grade. This includes children from birth through age 8.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Program/course sequence lacks a course in early language and literacy development.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise course sequence to include a course in early language and literacy development to meet state certification requirements for early childhood.

Written documentation of compliance with state certification requirement must be submitted to ADE within 30 days of State Board approval.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Courses reflect content covering early childhood age groups. Each course clearly refers to Pre-K through Grade 3 children. With the exception of one area, the program provides coherent scope and sequence of instruction.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. Some syllabi clearly aligned courses topics and objectives with assessments and state standards. Others used descriptions of activities versus true measurable objectives.

Alignment to national standards was not evident in any syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed above
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all course competencies to national standards.

See program approval recommendations for timeline for submission of course sequence and syllabi.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Not identified as benchmark/signature in syllabi.

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The syllabi had assignments identified for the course. However, there was no identification as a benchmark/signature assignment.

In the matrix, benchmark/signature assignments were identified for each standard.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Review all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly identify benchmark/signature assignments in syllabi.

See program approval recommendations for timeline for submission of syllabi.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

In general, rubrics are written appropriately for the specified assignments.

There was not a rubric for each benchmark/signature assignment.

Rubrics varied in complexity.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g., lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Include rubrics in syllabi for benchmark/signature assignments.

Evidence used for decision:

- Rubrics
- Syllabi
- Samples of student work

If Unmet, further action required:

Review all syllabi to ensure that rubrics exist for all benchmark assignment.

See program approval recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Student assignments were identified in the syllabi to be completed in field-based settings. However, the team was unable to gather evidence through questions or review of materials to determine how specific courses in a block relate to that block's internship.

There was not evidence of how the field experience placements in two settings (B-3, 4-8) were documented and verified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to internship requirements such as lesson planning, delivery, and assessment.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirement for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation instrument used by placement teacher seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although, dispositions are important, placement teachers also need to be evaluating the intern's ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s)

Ensure that each course has a clearly identified field experience that is aligned to standards and to the internship. Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the placement teacher and the course instructor.

Evidence used for decision:

- Midterm Appraisal of Intern Performance (Semester 1)
- Final Appraisal of Intern Performance

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the Appraisal of Intern Performance instrument is aligned to state and national standards.

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements on assessment instruments.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Students are required to complete student teaching for nine weeks each in both Birth through grade 3 and grades 4 through 8 classroom setting.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Preservice Teacher Handbook
- Student performance appraisal instruments for student teaching

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Early Childhood 9-week Student Teaching Evaluation uses an effecting rating scale, lists criteria aligned with standards and serves as a communication tool for feedback to the student.

The student teaching appraisal instruments are thorough and well structured. They are aligned with state standards, but there is no indication of alignment to national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Developing Assessment
- Final Assessment
- Early Childhood 9-week Student Teaching Evaluation

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument with national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings:

Most course syllabus identified key assignments and rubrics that were aligned with state standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Assignment rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The program does not have three years of data collected. The school has a plan for data collection and has data for spring 2006.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Continue to collect and report data for three years.

See specific program recommendations for submission of data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **New program**
- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with state and national standards and indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated Program Matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Elementary Education Partnership Program

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The College of Education's Partnership Program is a four-semester field-based program that works closely with elementary schools to prepare certified teachers for grades K-8. University and school faculty collaborate to develop and teach methods courses and supervise field experiences. Forty percent of the methods faculty are currently classroom teachers or school administrators.

Planned course "blocks" are scheduled each semester and methods courses are taught in partner schools for blocks one and two. The faculty includes work with children and classroom teachers during scheduled class times, and reading courses include a supervised practicum each semester. In the first semester pre-service teachers subscribe to a web-based tool that is used across the program for portfolio development and for assignments that are continued from one semester to the next.

Three modules of SPE 416 – a collaborative practices course – focus on different aspects of working with teachers and staff to support children with special needs and are part of each block of classes. Structured English immersion strategies are introduced in a course – SEI for Linguistically Diverse Learners – and reinforced in methods classes. All methods courses are aligned with the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards.

Methods courses in the first two semesters focus on the development of literacy skills and social studies. The third semester of the program is focused on math and science methods classes. Additional coursework on classroom organization and management and understanding the classroom culture tie all the program coursework into a cohesive whole. Student teaching is completed in the fourth semester.

Preservice teachers complete an internship or clinical experience of six hours a week, 72 hours total, at their partner school each semester prior to student teaching as a requirement of their Field Experience course. Interns complete specific observation and teaching activities/assignments each semester, and their classroom placements across the program must represent the K-8 range of elementary teacher certification. Most partner schools serve ethnically and/or economically diverse populations.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other.

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. EED 478 is also used in other elementary education programs.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely and there is a correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C)(5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation of students in the internship classes are dispositional in nature.

There was correlation to the evaluation and national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Clearly align evaluation instrument with national standards.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured but there is limited evidence that it is aligned to national standards.

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers is aligned to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes are dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix was aligned to coursework, field experiences, and assessments that are identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Data that was available was not program specific but rather college specific. The data included all programs lumped together.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Three (3) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **All** core program components present
- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- Two years of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Field experience is built into coursework. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each session. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on experience in low SES schools, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

Students expressed satisfaction with the program.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Elementary Education (Indian Education) Indigenous Teacher Preparation Program (ITC)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The ITP Program prepares certified elementary teachers who plan to work with Indigenous students with a specialized knowledge base to meet their unique educational and culturally related academic needs. They will become advocates for Indigenous children and serve as change agents in educational reform by learning about critical issues as applied to American Indian education such as the sovereign status of Indigenous Nations, Indigenous histories, cultures, and language. They will gain knowledge about innovative teaching practices, strategies and research.

ITP is a four semester program designed to integrate a holistic Indigenous approach to academics couples with applied learning situations experienced in field practicum. Throughout the semesters, field practicums are experienced in schools that serve Indigenous communities, as well as public schools with a high number of American Indian children. These practicum experiences offer the diversity of each community, its social culture, and development of sensitivity toward histories, culture, and language. Through weekly seminars, teachers examine their role as an individual, a member of the community, and a guest in the community. Further, they experience the spirit of advocacy and gain a sense of empowerment.

ITP provides additional opportunities through the Center for Indian Education. The Center assists the program in sustaining partnerships with Indigenous communities, providing professional development opportunities like workshops and conferences, as well an induction support in the first year of teaching.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. BLE 478 is also used in the Dine Teacher Prep Program.

There is not evidence that the program is aligned to National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads (3)

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

Provide all course syllabi.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in any syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. Few rubrics were presented that were used to evaluate assignments.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix however; syllabi did not identify those assignments as benchmark/signature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark/signature assignment through the syllabi so that there is alignment to the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were few rubrics available for review associated with any assignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics for them.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's apprenticeship. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The intern placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with internships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Very few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluations of students in the internship classes are primarily dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluations of students in the internship classes are dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during weeks 1-5 in student teaching but the other expectations were not evident or available

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers are align to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is thorough and well structured but not aligned to National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program has not been in existence long enough to have candidate assessment data available. There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The program has a set of core courses in the four blocks of the program. The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other block by block.

Field experience is built into blocks I, II, and III. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each block. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on ELL education, particularly with regard to Indigenous languages and cultures, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

The program is administered by enthusiastic staff.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Integrated Certification in Teacher Education (INCITE)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

INCITE is a self-paced, post-baccalaureate program geared toward working adults interested in achieving secondary teaching certification. Students are involved in an array of experiences, learn the most recent teaching strategies, and become an interactive force in the development of a professional teacher education model. Students also participate in teaching experiences with a mentor teacher and students in designated urban schools.

INCITE is designed to meet three major goals. First, the program provides a fast-track path to initial certification in secondary education. Students have the potential of completing methods courses and student teaching in one year. Second, the field experiences in the Phoenix, Union High School District offer an excellent opportunity for participants to immediately apply what they are learning in the coursework in diverse settings. Third, the program provides participations with an opportunity to use selected coursework (21 hours) toward a master's degree in education.

In addition, coursework enables program to earn a middle grade endorsement by student teaching in grades 7-9, completion of EDP 514, and completion of SED 598: Middle/Secondary Curriculum course. These features have proven to be very attractive to prospective participants.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other.

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. SED 478 is also used in other secondary education programs.

There is not evidence that the program is aligned to National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in all syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. There were few rubrics presented that were used to evaluate assignments.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix however; syllabi did not identify those assignments as benchmark/signature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark/signature assignments through the syllabi so that there is alignment to the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were few rubrics available for review associated with any assignment.

Benchmark assignments were not clearly identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics for them.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's internships. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The intern placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with internships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Very few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during weeks 1-5 in student teaching but the other expectations were not evident or available

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers is align to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured but not aligned to National Standards.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Field experience is built into coursework. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each session. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on experience in low SES schools, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

Students expressed satisfaction with the program.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Multicultural/Multicultural Concentration Program (MLMC)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Multilingual/Multicultural education program concentration prepares teachers to teach elementary students whose primary language is Spanish or Native American language spoken in Arizona. The multicultural concentration prepares teachers to teach English as a Second Language to children for whom it is a second language.

The MLMC program is a four semester sequence offered in "blocks" with focused field requirements in urban and multicultural elementary schools and other bilingual or ESL settings. Methods courses are divided into BLE or ESL sections, although some coursework is planned together to promote collaboration. The program meets AZ requirements for an elementary education teaching certificate with an endorsement in bilingual education or English as a Second Language.

Language Proficiency: Language proficiency requirements must be met for each endorsement prior to completion of the professional program.

- Bilingual endorsement for Spanish. Students pass the Spanish binlingual certification examination administered at several colleges in AZ.
- Binlingual endorsement for an American Indian language. Proficiencies are verified in writing by an official of the appropriate tribe.
- English as a Second Language. Language proficiency is generally met by completing six college credits in a single language.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. BLE 478 is also used in the Dine Teacher Prep Program.

There is not evidence that the program is aligned to National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads (3)

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

Provide all course syllabi.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in any syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Very few syllabi clearly identified the benchmark/signature assignment. It was difficult to identify specifically which assignment was a benchmark assignment without looking at the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. There were few rubrics presented that were used to evaluate assignments.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix however; syllabi did not identify those assignments as benchmark/signature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark/signature assignment through the syllabi so that there is alignment to the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were few rubrics available for review associated with any assignment.

Benchmark assignments were not clearly identified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics for them.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's apprenticeship. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The intern placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with internships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Very few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature.

It was not evident that evaluation instruments were aligned to national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during weeks 1-5 in student teaching but the other expectations were not evident or available

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers is align to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured but not aligned to National Standards.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program has not been in existence long enough to have candidate assessment data available. There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The program has a set of core courses in the four blocks of the program. The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other block by block.

Field experience is built into blocks I, II, and III. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each block. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on ELL education, particularly with regard to Indigenous languages and cultures, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

The program is administered by enthusiastic staff.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: BAE Secondary Education

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

Initial Teacher Certification (ITC) programs in Secondary Education prepare pre-service teachers for careers working with middle and high school students. The Secondary Education Program for Initial Teacher Certification includes College of Education content courses and an academic specialization, which requires 30-56 semester hours in a discipline. The secondary education program includes eighteen areas of specialization. This program does not include P.E. and this section of the review does not include the arts' programs. After completing 120 credit hours, graduates are eligible for certification by the State of Arizona in grades 7-12. An emphasis is placed on field experiences where students are on-site in 7th-12th grade classrooms. The teaching methods coursework is partnered with field experiences.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Program provides coherent scope and sequence of instruction. It includes eleven courses plus three one-hour courses of field experience and 12 hours of student teaching totaling 44 credit hours.

Program of study includes courses specific to inclusion, SEI, assessment, education psychology, adolescent development, technology, and literacy in content areas.

There was a discrepancy in the title of SPF 401 Theory in Practices in Education or Teachers and the Law. (i.e., the check-off sheets)

Content specialization areas vary greatly in their credit hour requirements. They range from 30 hours (B.A.E. Secondary Education Geography) to 55 hours (B.A.E. Secondary Education Social Studies – Geography) and 55-56 hours ((B.A.E. Middle School Social Studies). Some of the academic areas (i.e. English) determine whether candidates are well prepared in the academic area through transcript evaluation prior to admission to the College of Education.

It was not clear in the documentation the difference between B.A.E. Secondary Education Social Studies – History and B.A.E. Secondary Education (History).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Website
- Syllabi
- Interview with ITC Associate Director
- Presentation by Director of C & I
- Group presentations by graduates , students and supervising teachers
- Interview with students

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Inconsistent alignment to State and National Standards.

Inconsistent identification of coursework topics/objectives and competencies.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. In addition, two different syllabi for the same course (SED 403) did not include the same benchmark assignments.

The methods courses within each academic area are structured independently of the College of Education. The content area faculty was not available to respond to questions concerning topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments, field experience assignments, or assessments in the methods courses and the COE staff did not have a clear understanding of the content area faculty expectations.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Reflect the strong integration of coursework within the field experience component in the course information. Course assignments are often implemented within the field experience, but there is no mention of this in the course descriptions and often not in the syllabi. There is also no reference to the necessity of concurrently being registered in field experience with most of the courses.

Indicate on the course check-off sheets the eight courses that require concurrent enrollment in a field experience. For example: “*Course requires concurrent enrollment in field experience.”

Design and require faculty to use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to state and national standards, benchmark assignments, and course-based field experiences. Syllabi should use standard language.

Coordinate efforts with the academic departments so that the COE can be certain that the instruction in the methods courses is standards-based and coordinates with the field experience courses where students are practicing the pedagogy they are learning in the methods courses.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Course Catalogue
- Website
- Syllabi
- Course check-off sheets
- Interview with ITC Associate Director (1)

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to national (INTASC) standards at the performance and indicator level.

Review and align all syllabi to the Arizona Teaching Standards at the indicator level.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Benchmark assignments were not clearly delineated or aligned to state standards.

It was difficult to assess the rigor of the benchmark assignments because minimal information was provided. Therefore, it is unknown if the benchmark assignments are carefully chosen and serve the program well in assessing the candidates' competencies in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences and assessments.

Discrepancies were noted between the benchmark assignments in the syllabi and the Program Matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Standardize the benchmark assignments and corresponding rubrics so the program is comprehensive and students can expect the same competencies and standards to be covered when two different instructors are teaching the same course.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi
- Course catalogue

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard-based language.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of the documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics were not evident.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements for each benchmark assignment.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of the rubrics.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

ASU is currently piloting a one-credit course that offers students the opportunity to explore science teaching as a profession by participating in field experiences early in their college education.

Three field experiences are required each of the first three semesters. The requirement is twelve weeks in a school site for six hours per week for a minimum total of 72 hours per field experience.

Step 2 documentation states that 8 courses other than SED 496 Field Experiences and the two method courses require concurrent enrollment in the Field Experience course. This is mentioned in only two course syllabi. This requirement is not mentioned in the catalogue, the website or the course check-off sheets.

The field experience assignments are not clearly identified even though it is obvious that the field experiences are the heart of the program. When asked about the alignment of coursework and field experiences, staff easily cited examples of how this was occurring. One instructor stated that field experience is so infused in the program and the curriculum that it is invisible.

The course check-off sheet indicates that the one-hour field experience classes are to be taken each semester and student teaching the final semester.

Half of a student's field experiences including student teaching must be in a diverse setting.

There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

The student teaching program in Latin America has grown from one country partnership to three. Faculty indicated that this program has had a profound impact on the students participating particularly in the area of learning what it feels like to be the minority and being faced with the insecurity of learning a new language.

University supervisors all have their Masters' degree and are teaching experts.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Clearly identify the close connection between the field experience and the coursework within the course information documents.

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor including the academic methods instructors.

Find ways to include the academic departments in designing field experience assignments and assessments that are comprehensive and aligned with state and national standards.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers which clearly delineates the related field experiences by course.

One student remarked, "There is something to be learned from each mentor teacher in each field experience. They are placing us with the best."

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Website
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Interview with ITC Associate Director (1)
- Group presentations by graduates (2), students (3) and supervising teachers (2)
- Group presentation with instructors

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Reflection journals were thoughtful, detailed and referred to the standards.

No rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

Intern evaluations reflect dispositions as well as pedagogy, but are not aligned with state or national standards.

Mentor teachers evaluate each candidate twice during the semester.

The academic record of all ITC students is reviewed at the end of each semester by student services. The Faculty Review Process calls for the faculty to notify student services when a student has not met the academic standards. This has been very successful. According to faculty, there are fewer academic and management issues with student teachers and the retention rate has increased.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Modify the field experience evaluation instruments to include specific benchmark assignments from the methods coursework.

Consider scaffolding the field experience evaluations. This would allow a sequencing of standards throughout the coursework and might make it easier to coordinate with the academic methods instructors.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 Documentation
- Syllabi
- Intern and Mentor Handbooks
- Interview with Director Professional Field Experiences

If Unmet, further action required:

Align field experience rubrics to state and national standards at the standard and indicator levels.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Student teaching placements are made by The Office of Professional Field Experiences in collaboration with district personnel.

Student teaching requires 12-credit hours for a total of 600 clock hours of which 210 hours are actual teaching.

Student Faculty Ratio in Student Teaching: 9.36:1

Three Saturday seminars are provided each semester for student teachers on topics they select. Each supervisors creates two seminars specifically tailored to their group of student teachers.

Mentor teachers remarked at a meeting that secondary education student teachers had been well prepared in the four content areas.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 Documentation
- Syllabi
- Student Teaching Materials
- Program Matrix
- Group presentations by graduates, students and supervising teachers
- Interview with Director Professional Field Experiences

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course descriptions, topic/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation instrument is rigorous, thorough and well structured.

The student teaching evaluation instrument is aligned to state standards.

The student teaching evaluation instrument is not aligned with national standards.

Their mentor teachers evaluate student teachers on three instruments throughout the semester.

The university supervisor makes a minimum of five visits to the classroom, three of which are formal observations.

Students must receive a minimum of 81% on the final assessment. The vast majority of student teachers from Spring 2003- Spring 2005 met this requirement.

Mentor teachers are highly qualified.

If concerns about a student teacher arise the Office of Professional Field Experiences is very proactive and has been very successful creating faculty review committees and assisting students in designing professional growth plans. Four doctoral students are used to counsel at-risk students. The students are required to email their counselor once a week. Faculty indicated that this student support service has been very successful.

Use of Task Stream in student teaching is mandatory for students and supervisors.

The use of Task Stream by university supervisors will reach its final phase-in stage Fall 2007 with the addition of journaling. According to staff, taking it one step at a time as been very successful – there is 100% participation.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Student Teaching Materials
- Interview with Director Professional Field Experiences
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument to national standards.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

The matrix did not provide evidence of how standards are being addressed related to course work, field experience work, and assessment.

It was difficult to find alignment between hard-copy portfolios and assignments noted in the program matrices. The four student portfolios provided included reflection papers and lesson plans. The four portfolios were comprised primarily of reproduced resources.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

In the ongoing evaluation and refinement of the assessments, give special consideration to those assessments that may not directly measure a student's competency in the specific performance objectives within the standards. For example, interviews and surveys in and of themselves may not accurately measure a student's ability to design and plan instruction. On the other hand, an interview assignment could be designed in such a way that it could be an excellent measure of such skills.

In the process of standardizing syllabi within the program be careful to check that the benchmark assignments delineated in those syllabi match those in the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

Resubmit program matrix.

See program recommendation for timeline for re-submission of the program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No data was available.

There is no evidence that the program faculty used information from assessments to improve candidate performance and facilitate program change.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Design a process to involve the entire faculty related to ITC in using information from assessments to improve candidate performance and facilitate program change.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

College needs to submit all programmatic data for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with state and national standards and indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated Program Matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Admissions requirements include demonstrated experience within the population the student plans to teach and a fingerprint clearance one month prior to joining the program. Several clubs and organizations provide opportunities for freshmen and sophomores to get this experience. This coming year, '07-'08 freshmen will be admitted to the College of Education.

Continue to pursue a stronger working relationship with the academic methods instructors. The physics, earth science, and history departments have designated specific faculty members to work with the COE.

Earth and Space Science is a new area of academic specialization that will be available next year. It was a collaboratively developed major between the two colleges.

The Provost has charged the COE and the College of Art and Sciences to develop an undergraduate degree that leads to secondary certification in math and science in four years. ASU is in the process of applying for a National Math and Science Institute grant designed to attract excelling math and science students into a career in teaching - plans are to go ahead with or without the funding. ASU offers several incentive scholarship programs specifically targeting math, science, engineering and technology.

Students and graduates speak very highly of the instructors within the COE.

In the past five years, 349 undergraduate and graduate students applied for their secondary math or science certificate. In '05-'06, 75 students applied for certification.

Technology use within classrooms varies widely by individual instructors in academic departments and the COE. There currently is no infrastructure established to provide widespread training in the use of technology.

Students refer to confusion about the requirements of the program prior to meeting with an advisor. However, once students met with an advisor, expectations were clarified.

A listserv was created this year for use in improving communications between Secondary Education students. A Secondary Advisor maintains the listserv.

Administration indicated that a new coordinator for the Secondary Education program will be assigned soon.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Art Education (K-12 Program Preparation)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

In cooperation with the College of Education a K-12 endorsement for teacher certification is available in art for students preparing for a teaching career in the public schools. Students should, with the advice and counsel of their arts education advisors, fulfill the requirements for the appropriate area of specialization under the Bachelor of Fine Arts. Students must also meet the admission criteria of the Initial Teacher Certification program, through the College of Education.

The field of art education involves the study of art, policy making in art, how people learn about art, and how instructors or administrators can facilitate this learning. It encompasses public and private K-12 instruction, art in higher education, and education programs in art museums. Student teaching in art education occurs only in the Spring semester. To be accepted into student teaching, a student must be recommended in writing by the art education faculty and must have completed all art education classes.

Graduates who also complete the state certification requirements for an "Art Specialist" certificate teach in public and private elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. Graduates who do not seek state certification may find opportunities for jobs with art museums and recreational and/or community service groups that offer art instruction.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Art education students complete methods classes across K-12 spectrum

Art education students showed high-level competencies in methods class visited by Site Team.

Art education faculty expressed gratitude for collegial working relationship with the administration at College of Education, including the support for student teachers and membership in the Initial Teacher Certification Council.

Art education program lists College of Education courses for certification requirements above program listing, creating a **large** number of credits for BFA + Certification (listed as 156 in the program notebook).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): Three years of verified teaching experience in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Revision of the course program sequence in collaboration with the College of Education to allow students to exit the program with total combined credits of 120-130 similar to NAU and following the recommended guidelines of both NCATE and NASAD (National Association for Schools of Art and Design). One model to consider is that of the music education program of study.

Evidence used for decision:

- Site Team Member site visit to Art Education class in early April

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Course syllabi are unique to the faculty member teaching the course. While an individual teaching approach is appropriate, each syllabus should include alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, to the national art standards, to the Arizona Art Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Systematize the inclusion of Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, the voluntary national art standards and Arizona Art Standards for each Program Syllabus from the School of Art.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program syllabi provided in documentation box.

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Examples of student performance were of high quality.

Program matrix referred to student performance against identified AZ Professional Teaching Standards competencies; Program evidence did not always include examples of student performance to show basis for the determination in the matrix (e.g. ARE 482; ARE 470).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Maintain thorough student records across all program courses which correlate with evidence listed on program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Student work examples

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics/assessment tools for each benchmark assignment were not present.

Those assessment tools that were available were (overall) of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Provided program documentation

If Unmet, further action required:

Document rubric/assessment tools for all courses listed in program sequence such that an outside reader can easily identify the corresponding benchmark assignments.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Art education students have field experiences supervised directly by art education faculty via Herberger College for Kids.

Art education faculty provide multiple field experience opportunities for students in a variety of K-12 settings within methods courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation provided
- Interviews with faculty and students

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Official field experience reporting form for “interns” is not currently aligned to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Evidence of student competencies, when available, were of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Field Experience forms (interim and final) provided by College of Education.

If Unmet, further action required:

Align field experience evaluation instruments to AZ State Teaching Standards.

Include relationship to Content (Art) Standards.

Provide evidence of student competencies for all program courses included in program review.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Visual art education faculty spoke highly of Joyce Hall, art student teacher supervisor for the School of Art. Concerns were expressed about her ability to handle the workload, and sustainability of this position over time.

Art education faculty provide help with art education student teaching placements, maintaining a high quality network for master teachers across the Valley.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences** and **capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Herberger College of the Arts should investigate ways to provide a sustainable plan for supervisory support for art education student teachers

Evidence used for decision:

- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

Specific findings for each course listed in the program matrix was well done.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No data was provided by College of Education.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Part 2 of program submission and document files

If Unmet, further action required:

College of Education in partnership with the Herberger College of the Arts needs to submit all programmatic data for art education majors for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Three (3) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **All** core program components present
- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Art education faculty are active members of Arizona's art education community, and students are, overall, pleased with the program.

The Herberger College of the Arts has a unique opportunity to **expand** its art education programs given the current confluence of:

High need for art educators in Arizona public schools

Request from Vice President Garcia to increase the number of teachers graduating from all of ASU from 1400 to 2500 in the next decade

Additional requests for art education courses from general education majors

The Review Team suggests that the Herberger College meets with the Fulton College to study potential avenues for quality art education program expansion. Potential ideas include the sharing of arts education faculty across both colleges as modeled by the science teaching faculty in the College of Education and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Finding an entrepreneurial way to address the need for art educators in the field would be of great value to Arizona's education system.

In addition, the Review Team strongly encourages creating a course program sequence that is closer to 120-130 credits including certification for arts education majors in order to better market the program to potential majors.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Dance Education (K-12 Program Preparation)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The ASU Department of Dance works in conjunction with the ASU College of Education (CoE) to provide teacher certification in Dance, including a post-baccalaureate option. The unit offers coursework in dance education to supplement CoE coursework. In Arizona, candidates work toward K-12 certification in Dance. Dance coursework is designed to prepare teachers for K-12 instruction (though most full-time positions are at the secondary school level).

Students petition to the BFA in Dance with a concentration in Dance Education during spring of their sophomore year. If accepted, they follow a carefully designed sequence of courses beginning fall semester of their junior year. Students that are not accepted remain as dance majors and continue fulfilling BFA in Dance degree requirements. However, they may choose to reapply to the dance education concentration the following year. Once admitted into the concentration, students apply to the ITC program. Most students begin ITC coursework in the summer after their junior year and finish the coursework by student teaching during the fall semester after their senior year. Students also may opt to fulfill degree requirements in dance and graduate before beginning ITC coursework as a post-baccalaureate program. This option is available to students graduating with a four-year degree from other institutions that include a dance curriculum which meets 30 credit hours of approved coursework.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Dance education students complete methods classes across K-12 spectrum

Dance education faculty expressed gratitude for collegial working relationship with the administration at College of Education, including the support for student teachers and membership in the Initial Teacher Certification Council.

Dance education has created an excellent recommended course of study, semester by semester, for dance education students, showing how students can complete the program in 4 years + student teaching.

A few omnibus course numbers currently exist in the dance course catalog for dance education courses; however, Site Team members viewed an updated list of course numbers which has been sent to the Provost's office for approval and will (hopefully) appear in the course catalogue by Spring, 2008.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

The Site Team recommends that the Office of the Provost works quickly to alleviate the omnibus course numbering issue by issuing unique course numbers for courses in the Department of Dance.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program sequence

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Some course syllabi were aligned to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards and the national dance standards.

Course syllabi are unique to the faculty member teaching the course. While an individual teaching approach is appropriate, each syllabus should include alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, to the national dance standards, to the Arizona Dance Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Systematize the inclusion of Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, the voluntary national dance standards and Arizona Dance Standards for each Program Syllabus from the Department of Dance.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program syllabi provided in documentation box.

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Program matrix referred to student performance against identified AZ Professional Teaching Standards competencies

Program evidence did not include examples of student performance to show basis for the determination in the matrix

Student evidence provided showed high quality work aligned with the Professional Teaching Standards and the national/state dance standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Maintain thorough student records across all program courses which correlate with evidence listed on program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Student work examples

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics/assessment tools for each benchmark assignment were not present.

Those assessment tools that were available were (overall) of high quality.

Certain student examples of lesson plans, capstone research were of extraordinarily high quality.

The evidence box was not well-marked or organized for ease of program/course review.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

For future program review visits, the Team recommends more carefully labeling documentary evidence in the evidence boxes. Also, please check that the correct student work examples and vitae are with the course described.

Evidence used for decision:

- Provided program documentation.

If Unmet, further action required:

Document rubric/assessment tools for all courses listed in program sequence such that an outside reader can easily identify the benchmark assignments.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Dance education faculty help in field experience placements, including placement on community, charter and traditional public school settings.

Dance education faculty provide multiple field experience opportunities for students in a variety of K-12 settings within methods courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation provided; interviews with faculty and students.

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Official field experience reporting form for “interns” is not currently aligned to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Evidence of student competencies, when available, were of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Field Experience forms (interim and final) provided by College of Education.

If Unmet, further action required:

Align field experience evaluation instruments to AZ Professional Teaching Standards. Include relationship to Content (Dance) Standards.

Provide evidence of student competencies for all program courses included in program review.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Dance education faculty provide help with dance education student teaching placements, maintaining a high quality network for master teachers across the Valley.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

Program evidence did not include examples of student performance to show basis for the determination of candidate's competency in the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Provide score/competency results for students broken down by course code. See art education program matrix for example.

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No data was provided by College of Education.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Part 2 of program submission and document files.

If Unmet, further action required:

College of Education in partnership with the College of the Arts needs to submit all programmatic data for dance education majors for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Three (3) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **All** core program components present
- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Dance education faculty are active members of Arizona's dance education community, and students are, overall, pleased with the program.

The Herberger College of the Arts has an unique opportunity to **expand** its dance education programs given the current confluence of:

- High need for arts educators in Arizona public schools, due to growth in Arizona student population
- Request from Vice President Garcia to increase the number of teachers graduating from all of ASU from 1400 to 2500 in the next decade
- Additional requests for dance education courses from general education majors

The Review Team suggests that the Herberger College meets with the Fulton College to study potential avenues for quality arts education program expansion. Potential ideas include the sharing of arts education faculty across both colleges as modeled by the science teaching faculty in the College of Education and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Finding an entrepreneurial way to address the need for arts educators in the field would be of great value to Arizona's education system.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Music Education (K-12 Program Preparation: General/Choral, Instrumental (Band/Strings))

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The undergraduate music education program in the School of Music at Arizona State University prepares students for certification in grades K-12 and includes three concentrations: choral/general, instrumental and strings. The instrumental concentration is designed for those interested in teaching band in the public schools. The string concentration focuses on those who wish to teach strings and orchestra. The choral/general concentration is geared toward those interested in teaching general music or choir.

The curricular structure for all three tracks includes general education, professional education, basic musicianship, performance and music electives. Coursework includes opportunities for direct observation of master and peer teachers and for practice teaching. The music education courses are taught by faculty members who have been successful public school music teachers. Students' progress is assessed regularly throughout the program including an interview process at the end of the second year.

Each student completed field experience requirements (three semesters) including placements at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Student teaching includes two experiences: elementary/middle, elementary/high or middle/high school.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Music education students complete rigorous methods classes across K-12 spectrum, and apply pieces (e.g. assessment rubrics) from one methods class to another.

Music education students show high-level competencies in methods class visited by Site Team.

Music education faculty expressed gratitude for collegial working relationship with the administration at College of Education, including the support for student teachers and membership in the Initial Teacher Certification Council.

Music education faculty also appreciated the flexibility in defining the program for music education students in collaboration with College of Education faculty.

Music education program **includes** all courses required for both graduation and receiving certification in Arizona.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program syllabi provided in documentation box

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Course syllabi are unique to the faculty member teaching the course. While an individual teaching approach is appropriate, each syllabus should include alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, to the national music standards, to the Arizona Music Standards.

Secondary Methods Class provided updated syllabus including Arizona Music Standards and national standards – thank you!

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

School of Music should create equity in secondary methods classes in terms of course credit load and number of hours. Currently, Choral Methods meets for less time, potentially short-changing student learning in application of diction, sight-reading, score-reading, piano technique to choral teaching.

Systemize the inclusion of Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, the voluntary national music standards and Arizona Music Standards for each Program Syllabus from the School of Music.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program syllabi provided in documentation box
- Interviews with music education faculty

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Program matrix referred to student performance against identified AZ Teaching Standards competencies.

Program evidence did not always include examples of student performance to show basis for the determination in the matrix (e.g. MUE 110; MUE 480).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Maintain thorough student records across all program courses which correlate with evidence listed on program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Student work examples

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics/assessment tools for each benchmark assignment were not present.

Those assessment tools that were available were (overall) of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Provided program documentation.

If Unmet, further action required:

Document rubric/assessment tools for all courses listed in program sequence such that an outside reader can easily identify the corresponding benchmark assignments.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Music education students have early field experiences as underclassmen.

Music education faculty provide multiple field experience opportunities for students in a variety of K-12 settings within methods courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Interviews with music education faculty

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Official field experience reporting form for “interns” is not currently aligned to the AZ State Teaching Standards.

Music education faculty have developed additional field experience evaluation tools which are specific to music education students.

Evidence of student competencies, when available, were of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Field Experience forms (interim and final) provided by College of Education.

If Unmet, further action required:

Align field experience evaluation instruments to AZ Professional Teaching Standards. Include relationship to Content (music) Standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Music education faculty serves as supervisors for their student teachers. This is a large burden on top of current teaching/research loads.

Music education faculty provides help with music education student teaching placements, maintaining a high quality network for master teachers across the Valley.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Herberger College of the Arts should investigate ways to provide additional supervisory support for music education student teachers (and/or have supervision fall within the “normal” workload of music education faculty).

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Interviews with music education faculty

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

Specific findings for each course listed in the program matrix was well done.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No data was provided by College of Education.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Part 2 of program submission and document files.

If Unmet, further action required:

College of Education in partnership with the Herberger College of the Arts needs to submit all programmatic data for music education majors for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Three (3) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **All** core program components present
- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Music education faculty are active members of Arizona's music education community, and students are, overall, pleased with the program.

The Herberger College of the Arts has an unique opportunity to **expand** its music education programs given the current confluence of:

High need for music educators in Arizona public schools, particular string teachers

Request from Vice President Garcia to increase the number of teachers graduating from all of ASU from 1400 to 2500 in the next decade

Additional requests for music education courses from general education majors

The Review Team suggests that the Herberger College meets with the Fulton College to study potential avenues for quality music education program expansion. Potential ideas include the sharing of arts education faculty across both colleges as modeled by the science teaching faculty in the College of Education and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Finding an entrepreneurial way to address the need for music educators in the field would be of great value to Arizona's education system.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Theatre Education (K-12 Program Preparation)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The ASU School of Theatre and Film (formerly the Department of Theatre) works in conjunction with the ASU College of Education to provide post-baccalaureate teacher certification in Theatre. The unit offers coursework in theatre and theatre education to supplement COE coursework. Candidates work toward endorsement for “Dramative Arts” grades K-12, and Secondary Certification for Theatre grades 7-12. Hence, theatre education coursework is designed to prepare teachers for K-12 instruction (though most full-time positions are at the secondary school level).

Though the Theatre teacher certification program is post-bac, some undergraduate Theatre majors express an interest in obtaining teacher certification after completion of their B.A. degree in Theatre. As undergraduates, students can take all necessary courses for the content area, plus the majority of theatre education courses for teacher certification during their junior and senior years. Selected theatre education coursework (specifically THP 311 Improvisation with Youth and THP 411 Methods of Teaching Drama) provides opportunities for observing professors and graduate students teaching drama to children ages 5-11 on the ASU campus.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Theatre education students complete methods classes across K-12 spectrum

Theatre education faculty expressed gratitude for collegial working relationship with the administration at College of Education, including the support for student teachers and membership in the Initial Teacher Certification Council.

Theatre faculty gave a thorough description of entrance requirements and procedures for students desiring the post-baccalaureate certification program in theatre education.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Schedule of classes
- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Course syllabi are unique to the faculty member teaching the course. Some syllabi included alignment to the national and Arizona Theatre standards. Some syllabi included alignment with the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards. While an individual teaching approach is appropriate, each syllabus should include alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, to the national theatre standards, to the Arizona Theatre Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program syllabi provided in documentation box

If Unmet, further action required:

Systematize the inclusion of Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, the voluntary national theatre standards and Arizona Theatre Standards for every Program Syllabus for theatre education.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Program matrix referred to student performance against identified AZ Teaching Standards competencies and listed percentages of students meeting the competencies. The evidence box, however, did not contain sets of student examples for all courses included in the course of program.

For the courses where student examples were evident, however, the alignment of assessment to student work was evident.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Maintain thorough student records across all program courses which correlate with evidence listed on program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Student work examples

If Unmet, further action required:

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics/assessment tools for each benchmark assignment were not present.

Those assessment tools that were available were (overall) of high quality.

Certain student examples of lesson plans, capstone research were of high quality.

Faculty comments on student examples were insightful and creative.

One course syllabus described students working in concert with faculty to create evaluation tools for benchmark tasks. This is an appropriate practice, especially as it models what pre-service teachers can do with high school students. The team would have appreciated seeing, however, the described student-generated evaluation tools as well as examples of student work created in response to the tools.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Provided program documentation

If Unmet, further action required:

Document rubric/assessment tools for all courses listed in program sequence such that an outside reader can easily identify the benchmark assignments.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Theatre education faculty help in field experience placements

Theatre education faculty provide multiple field experience opportunities for students in a variety of K-12 settings within methods courses.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation provided
- interviews with faculty and students

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Official field experience reporting form for “interns” is not currently aligned to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Evidence of student competencies, when available, were of high quality.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Provide evidence of student competencies for all program courses included in program review.

Evidence used for decision:

- Field Experience forms (interim and final) provided by College of Education.

If Unmet, further action required:

Align field experience evaluation instruments to AZ Professional Teaching Standards. Include relationship to Content (Theatre) Standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Theatre education faculty provide help with theatre education student teaching placements, maintaining a high quality network for master teachers across the Valley.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documentation
- Faculty interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Provide score/competency results for students broken down by course code. See art education program matrix for example.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No data was provided by College of Education.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Part 2 of program submission and document files

If Unmet, further action required:

College of Education in partnership with the Herberger College of the Arts needs to submit all programmatic data for theatre education post-baccs for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Three (3) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **All** core program components present
- Matrix provides **sufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Dance education faculty are active members of Arizona's dance education community, and students are, overall, pleased with the program.

The Herberger College of the Arts has an unique opportunity to **expand** its theatre education programs given the current confluence of:

- High need for arts educators in Arizona public schools, due to growth in Arizona student population
- Request from Vice President Garcia to increase the number of teachers graduating from all of ASU from 1400 to 2500 in the next decade
- Additional requests for theatre education courses from general education majors

The Review Team suggests that the Herberger College meets with the Fulton College to study potential avenues for quality arts education program expansion. Potential ideas include the sharing of arts education faculty across both colleges as modeled by the science teaching faculty in the College of Education and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Finding an entrepreneurial way to address the need for arts educators in the field would be of great value to Arizona's education system.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Special Education (LD, MR, ED)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Special Education is an undergraduate program designed for students to acquire certification to work with students in grades K-12 who have learning disabilities, mental retardation, and/or behavioral disorders.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Program/course sequence meets certification requirements.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Syllabi
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Inconsistent
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Indicated on Program Matrix only
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi contained course descriptions, identified topics/objectives, and competencies.

The assignments were clearly written and had appropriate rubrics relevant to the assignment.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. Some syllabi clearly aligned courses topics and objectives with assessments and state standards. Although standards were identified for each competency, there was not a consistent alignment with the standard in many syllabi. For example, in the syllabus for SPE412, the competencies do not align with the state standards identified.

Most course syllabus identified key assignments that were aligned with state standards.

Alignment to national CEC Standards are evident in the program matrix. However, they are not identified in the course syllabi or on the assessment instruments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify alignment to APTS and national CEC Standards, signature/benchmark assignments including rubrics, and course-based field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed above.
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review all syllabi for consistent alignment of coursework competencies to APTS.

Align course competencies to CEC Standards at the performance and indicator levels.

See specific program approval recommendations for timeline for submission of syllabi.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ Not identified as benchmark in the syllabi

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ See comments below.

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi had assignments and rubrics identified for each course. However, there was no identification as a benchmark/signature assignment. In the matrix, some of the assignments were identified as benchmark assignments.

The benchmark assignments in the field experiences were not clearly identified. For example, in EDU 413, the field experience signature assignment is listed as "Practicum within the Course" in the Program Matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit syllabi for each course that clearly indicate benchmark assignments used to demonstrate candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards.

Review alignment of benchmark assignments between syllabi and Program Matrix.

See program approval recommendations for timeline for submission of syllabi and Program Matrix.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Relevant rubrics were created to assess each assignment.

In general, rubrics are written appropriately for the specified assignment. Rubrics varied in complexity.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition (“scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience”) ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Student assignments were identified in the syllabi to be completed in field-based settings. However, the team was unable to gather evidence through questions or review of materials to determine how specific courses in a block relate to that block's internship. For example in the “Preservice Teacher Handbook” it states “Semester 1, 6 clock hours minimum per week for a minimum of 12 weeks. Recommend intern to complete hours two to three days per week.”

By ADE definition, field experiences are “scheduled, directed experiences in a P-12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience.” Field experiences should be clearly identified and defined for each course. The matrix does not identify the field experience but states. “practicum within the course.”

The communication log assignment for the practicum in SPE 412 and SPE 413 could not be found in the syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences and specific assignments to be completed in field experience by course.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and Program Matrix are aligned.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation instrument used by placement teachers seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although, dispositions are important, placement teachers also need to be evaluating the intern's ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning. In addition since this is a special education program, Standard 9 on professional skills for special education were not assessed in the instrument.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Midterm Appraisal of Intern Performance
- Final Appraisal of Intern Performance
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the Appraisal of Intern Performance instrument and the Final Appraisal of intern Performance are aligned to state and national standards.

Create evaluation instruments with clear performance indicators and anchor statements.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Students stated that they were well prepared for student teaching by the Block field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

LEA personnel felt that a partnership was created with the university and they felt that communication was effective and that they were supported.

Students spoke positively about the quality of the instructors and instruction at ASU.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Preservice Teacher Handbook
- Interviews
- Student Performance Appraisal Instrument for Student Teaching

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching appraisal instrument is thorough and well structured. It is aligned with state standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Developing Assessment
- Final Assessment

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument with national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

The Program Matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches through field experience and coursework and assesses a candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards. The Program Matrix must provide evidence that supports this alignment.

Findings of the Team:

The benchmark assignments in the field experiences were not clearly identified. For example, in EDU 413, the field experience signature assignment is listed as "Practicum within the Course" in the Program Matrix.

Alignment to national CEC Standards is evident in the Program Matrix. However, they are not identified in the course syllabi or on the assessment instruments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and align where necessary course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and Program Matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The program does not have three years of data collected. The school has a plan for data collection and has data for spring 2006.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Continue to collect and report data for three years.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with state and national standards and indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated Program Matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Special Education Post-Bac Program (LD, ED, MR)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Special Education Post Bac Program is a program designed for students holding a bachelor's degree to acquire special education certification to work with students in grades K-12 who have learning disabilities, mental retardation, and/or behavioral disorders. The program provides preparation in each disability area, however, the certificate the student qualifies for is determined by their student teaching placement (ED, LD, or MR).

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Program/course sequence meets certification requirements.

According to program documentation, this program leads to certification in ED, LD, and MR. The certificates the student qualified for is determined by their student teaching placement. SPE 361 is Introduction to learning Disabilities, SPE 312 is Mental Retardation and SPE 336 is Behavioral and Emotional Problems in children.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Identify each student teaching placement with a unique coursework identifier.

For example LD is SPE 478 A; MR is SPE 478 B; ED is SPE 478 C.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Syllabi
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Inconsistent
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi contained course descriptions, identified topics/objectives, and competencies.

The assignments were clearly written and had appropriate rubrics relevant to the assignment.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. Some syllabi clearly aligned courses topics and objectives with assessments and state standards. Although standards were identified for each competency, there was not a consistent alignment with the standard in many syllabi. For example, the syllabus for SPE412, the competencies do not align with the state standards identified.

Alignment to national CEC standards are evident in the program matrix. However, they are not identified in the course syllabi or on the assessment instruments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify alignment to APTS and national CEC standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed above.
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review course syllabi to ensure that course competencies align with national standards.

Review course syllabi to ensure that all course competencies align to the appropriate Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐ Not identified as benchmark/signature

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The syllabi had assignments and rubrics identified for the course. However, there was no identification as a benchmark/signature assignment. In the matrix, some of the assignments were identified as benchmark assignments.

Relevant rubrics were created to assess each assignment.

The benchmark assignments in the field experiences were not clearly identified. For example, in EDU 413 in the matrix, the field experience signature assignment is listed as "Practicum within the Course".

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Review all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified and align with evidence on the program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐ (evident in rubrics that were available for review)

Findings of the Team:

In general, rubrics are written appropriately for the specified assignment.

Rubrics varied in complexity.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Rubrics in syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements for all benchmark assignments.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition (“scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience”) ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Student assignments were identified in the syllabi to be completed in field-based settings. However, the team was unable to gather evidence through questions or review of materials to determine how specific courses in a block relate to that block’s internship. For example in the “Preservice Teacher Handbook” it states “Semester 1, 6 clock hours minimum per week for a minimum of 12 weeks. Recommend intern to complete hours two to three days per week.” What exactly does the intern do?

By ADE definition, field experiences are. “scheduled, directed experiences in a P-12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience.” Field experiences should be clearly identified and defined for each course. The matrix does not identify the field experience but states. “practicum within the course.”

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences and specific assignments to be completed in field experience by course.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi and program matrix to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences are aligned.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation instrument used by placement teacher seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although, dispositions are important, placement teachers also need to be evaluating the intern's ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning. In addition since this is a special education program, Standard 9 on professional skills for special education were not assessed in the instrument.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review the evaluation instrument to align with APTS.

Evidence used for decision:

- Midterm Appraisal of Intern Performance (Semester 10)
- Final Appraisal of Intern Performance
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the Appraisal of Intern Performance instrument(s) are aligned to state and national standards.

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements on assessment instruments.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Students stated that they felt they were well prepared for student teaching by the Block field experiences prior to the capstone experience.

LEA personnel felt that a partnership was created with the university and they felt that communication was effective and that they were supported.

Students spoke positively about the quality of the instructors and instruction at ASU.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Preservice Teacher Handbook
- Interviews
- Student performance appraisal instrument for student teaching

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching appraisal instrument is thorough and well structured. It is aligned with state standards.

The communication log assignment for the practicum in SPE 412 and SPE 413 could not be found in the syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Developing Assessment
- Final Assessment

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument with national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and course work) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to course work, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Assignment rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi and program matrix to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences are aligned.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The school has a plan for data collection and has data for spring 2006.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Continue to collect and report data.

See specific program approval recommendations for submission of data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **New program**
- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align course competencies with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessment to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards.
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Special Education/Elementary Education Dual Certification Program

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Special Education Dual Certification program is an undergraduate program designed for students who wish to acquire certification to work with children who have disabilities as well as those who do not. The cross-categorical program prepares individuals to work with children in grades K-12 who have mild to moderate learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional/behavioral disorders, and orthopedic/other health impairments, as well as work with non disabled children in grades K-8.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Although the survey course, SPE 311, is not listed in the course sequence, according to interviews and checklist, it is a prerequisite. For students, who do not meet the requirement, the course is taken in Block 1.

The original program review, lists a five credit course, SPE 394, Foundations of LD, EH, MR, PD/OHI. According to interviews with the program director and the checklist, the course has been changed to two three-credit courses: SPE 303 Foundations of LD and EH, and SPE 304 Foundations of MR and PD/OHI.

Program/course sequence meets certification requirements.

This program leads to elementary certification K-8 and special education K-12. All coursework appears to focus on K-8.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

To meet the needs of K-12 special education certification, review methods courses to see that methodology for 9 -12 is addressed.

Ensure that field experiences in special education include middle school or high school experiences.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Syllabi
- Interviews
- Checklist

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit to ADE within 30 days of State Board approval a revised course/program sequence reflecting SPE 303 and SPE 304.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Inconsistent
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi contained course descriptions, identified topics/objectives, and competencies.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. Some syllabi clearly aligned courses topics and objectives with assessments and state standards. Although standards were identified for each competency, there was not a consistent alignment with the standard in many syllabi. For example, the syllabus for SPE413, the competencies do not align with the state standards identified.

Alignment to national CEC standards are evident in the program matrix. However, they are not identified in the course syllabi or on the assessment instruments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify alignment to APTS and national CEC standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed above
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review course syllabi to ensure that course competencies align with national standards.

Review course syllabi to ensure that all course competencies align to the appropriate Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒ Not identified as benchmark/signature

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The syllabi had assignments and rubrics identified for the course. However, there was no identification as a benchmark/signature assignment. In the matrix, some of the assignments were identified as benchmark assignments.

On the program matrix, some courses were listed with the statement: “No artifacts/indicators due to its development as a new course.” If no benchmark assignment or artifact/indicator is developed, why is it necessary to list this in the program matrix?

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Review all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified and align with evidence on the program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐ (evident in rubrics that were available for review)

Findings of the Team:

The assignments were clearly written in the syllabi, however, there was no evidence of appropriate rubrics relevant to the assignments.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements for all benchmark assignments.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Student assignments were identified in the syllabi to be completed in field-based settings.

It is unclear how students are placed in field experiences in each special education category as well as across grade levels K-12.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences and specific assignments to be completed in field experience by course.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi and program matrix to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences are aligned.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation instrument used by placement teacher seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although, dispositions are important, placement teachers also need to be evaluating the intern's ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning. In addition since this is a special education program, Standard 9 on professional skills for special education were not assessed in the instrument.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Review the evaluation instrument to align with APTS.

Evidence used for decision:

- Midterm Appraisal of Intern Performance (Semester 1)
- Final Appraisal of Intern Performance
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the Appraisal of Intern Performance instrument(s) are aligned to state and national standards.

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements on assessment instruments.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching is divided into two blocks. The blocks are fifteen weeks of student teaching in a regular elementary classroom, and fifteen weeks in special education.

The criteria for placement are not stated in the program review. How are multiple setting determined and verified in field experience and student teaching?

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Clearly identify the criteria for student teaching placement in multiple category (3 of 5) settings such as cross categorical special education.

Evidence used for decision:

- Preservice Teacher Handbook
- Interviews
- Student performance appraisal instrument for student teaching

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching appraisal instrument is thorough and well structured.

Although it is evident that the instrument is tied to national standards, only state standards are identified on the instrument.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Developing Assessment
- Final Assessment

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument with national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified.	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	------------------------------	---

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and course work) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to course work, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Assignment rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi and program matrix to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences are aligned.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The school has a plan for data collection and has data for spring 2006.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

See program approval recommendation for submission of additional data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **New Program**
- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align course competencies with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessment to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards.
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Teacher Education and Certification Highway (TEACH + ME)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

TEACH + ME is a self-paced, post-baccalaureate program geared toward working adults interested in achieving elementary teaching certification. Students are involved in an array of experiences, learn the most recent teaching strategies, and become an interactive force in the development of a professional teacher education model. Students also participate in teaching experiences with a mentor teacher and students in designated urban schools.

TEACH + ME is designed to meet three major goals. First, the program was designed to provide a fast-track path to initial certification in elementary education. The program meets this important goal by providing participants with the potential to take methods courses and complete student teaching in one year. Second, coursework and supervised field experiences offer an excellent opportunity for participants to immediately apply what they are learning in the coursework. All field experiences are completed in the Phoenix Elementary School District—hence all placements meet the diversity criteria (sister sites also include Isaac and Murphy School Districts). Third, a master's degree in elementary education. This feature has proven to be very attractive to prospective participants.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The courses are sequential in nature and build upon each other.

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program. EED 478 is also used in other elementary education programs.

There is not evidence that the program is aligned to National Standards

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B) ;(C) ;(D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission documents
- Syllabi
- Interview with Department Heads

If Unmet, further action required:

Student teaching course numbers must be unique to each program.

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Alignment to national standards was not evident in all syllabi; alignment to state standards was at various levels.

Very few syllabi clearly identified the benchmark/signature assignment. It was difficult to identify specifically which assignment was a benchmark assignment without looking at the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Ensure that all courses address common themes of assessment; developmentally appropriate practice; reflective practice; integration of technology; and accommodation of instruction, management, and assessment for special populations.

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g. lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed in table above
- Rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to National Standards.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No syllabi identified the benchmark/signature assignment. There were few rubrics presented that were used to evaluate assignments.

There was evidence that benchmark/signature assignments were identified in the program matrix however; syllabi did not identify those assignments as benchmark/signature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark/signature assignments through the syllabi so that there is alignment to the program matrix.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi and supporting materials in program files
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Realign all coursework and benchmark assignments to state and national standards.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix. See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There were few rubrics available for review associated with any assignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Designate benchmark/signature assignments and design rubrics for them.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Team is unclear as to how specific courses in a block relate to that block's internships. Many courses did not have a specific field experience identified. The intern placements are well organized with specific outcomes but need to be better coordinated with the coursework specific to that block. The program matrix did not refer to the apprenticeship at all. There were no benchmark/signature assignments associated with internships. There was no evidence as to how the field experiences align to state/national standards or help students develop skills and knowledge related to the standards.

In interviews with faculty there is evidence that field experiences are monitored closely but there is no specific correlation between assignments in the methods classes and in the field.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the mentor teacher and the course instructor.

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirements for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with staff

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that each field experience is clearly identified and is aligned to the standards.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Very few rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were available.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2); Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603

Recommendation(s):

Create rubrics for the mentor teachers that align to specific outcomes related to apprenticeship requirements, such as lesson planning and delivery, assessment, etc.

The evaluation of students in the internship classes seem more dispositional in nature. Although dispositions are important, mentors also need to be evaluating the intern's content knowledge, pedagogy, and classroom management skills. A more rounded evaluation of the students practice is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the assessments and other field experience evaluation rubrics are aligned to national standards.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Evidence was found in the program materials that outlines what students and supervising teachers are to do during weeks 1-5 in student teaching but the other expectations were not evident or available

The assessments used to evaluate student teachers is align to the AZ Professional Teaching Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured but not aligned to National Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student teaching materials

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the student teaching evaluation is aligned to national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and coursework) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5); Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit program matrices. See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised matrices.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There was no evidence of a plan for gathering and analyzing data.

Minimal data for other program assessments (e.g., student teaching, literacy assessments, and signature assignments) were presented.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3); Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program submission document and program files

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan to the State Board of Education for gathering and analyzing assessment data. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Field experience is built into coursework. The intent is for the intern teacher is to practice the content taught in each session. Exact expectations are not clear nor outlined regarding assignments.

There is a strong emphasis on experience in low SES schools, but there is not an indication that other special populations (e.g. gifted and talented) are included in classes or are a common thread throughout coursework.

Students expressed satisfaction with the program.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Teacher Education and Certification Highway Early Childhood

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Teacher Education and Certification Highway Early Childhood (TEACH+ME ECD) is designed to meet three major goals. First, the program was designed to provide a fast-track path to initial certification in early childhood education. Second, the coursework and supervised field experiences offer participants an opportunity to apply what they are learning in coursework. Third, the selected coursework may be applied toward a master's degree in early childhood ed.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

All course requirements for certification are met. Some of the state requirements were embedded in the course requirements.

In a phone call to Dr. Billie Enz, the course ECD 549 will be renamed to include "Foundations".

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify the following: alignment to national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience. Syllabi should use standard language to refer to these elements.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Syllabi
- Meetings with Early Childhood team members

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit a revised course/program sequence that reflects the title change for ECD 549 within 30 days of State Board approval.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Courses reflect content covering early childhood age groups. Each course refers to Birth through Grade 3 children.

Syllabi were divergent in style and structure. Some syllabi clearly aligned courses topics and objectives with assessments and state standards. Others used descriptions of activities versus true measurable objectives.

Alignment to national standards was not evident in any syllabi.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Create and have faculty use a standard template for syllabi to clearly identify alignment to APTS and national standards, signature/benchmark assignments, and course-based field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi using checklist to identify all items listed above.
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review course syllabi and align course competencies to national standards.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐

Unmet ☒ Not identified as benchmark/signature

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The syllabi had assignments identified for the course. However, there was no identification as a benchmark/signature assignment.

In the matrix, benchmark/signature assignments were identified for each standard.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified and align with evidence on the program matrix.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

In general, rubrics are written appropriately for the specified assignments.

Rubrics varied in complexity.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments (e.g., lesson plans) using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Include rubrics in syllabi for benchmark/signature assignments.

Evidence used for decision:

- Rubrics
- Syllabi
- Samples of student work

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Student assignments were identified in the syllabi to be completed in field-based settings.

There was not evidence of how the field experience placements in two settings (B-3, 4-8) were documented and verified.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create a matrix for use by the students, faculty, field placement personnel, and mentor teachers that clearly delineates the related field experiences by course as well as other requirement for the block.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The evaluation instrument used by placement teacher seems to be more dispositional in nature. Although, dispositions are important, placement teachers also need to be evaluating the interns ability to effectively design and plan instruction, implement and manage instruction, and assess student learning.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s)

Ensure that each course has a clearly identified field experience that is aligned to standards and to the internship. Require students to complete specific assignments that are evaluated using an assignment-specific rubric by the placement teacher and the course instructor.

Evidence used for decision:

- Midterm Appraisal of Intern Performance (Semester 1)
- Final Appraisal of Intern Performance

If Unmet, further action required:

Ensure that the Appraisal of Intern Performance instrument(s) are aligned to state and national standards.

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements on assessment instruments.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Students are required to complete student teaching in both Birth through grade 3 and grades 4-8 for nine weeks each.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student performance appraisal instruments for student teaching

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Early Childhood 9-week Student Teaching Evaluation uses an effecting rating scale, lists criteria aligned with standards and serves as a communication tool for feedback to the student.

The student teaching appraisal instruments are thorough and well structured. They are aligned with state standards, but there is no indication of alignment to national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student Teaching Developing Assessment
- Final Assessment
- Early Childhood 9-week Student Teaching Evaluation

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument with national standards.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and course work) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to course work, field work, and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Assignment rubrics

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi and program matrix to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences are aligned.

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for re-submission of program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The school has a plan for data collection and has data for spring 2006.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

See specific program approval recommendation for timeline for submission of data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **New Program**
- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align course competencies with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessment to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards.
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM REVIEW

PROGRAM NAME: TEAMS (Teacher Education for Arizona Mathematics and Science)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The TEAMS program is a community-based middle school (grades 5-9) and secondary (7-12) science and mathematics teacher preparation program that is the result of collaboration between Chandler Unified School District, the Arizona Teacher Excellence Coalition (AzTEC) and Arizona State University's College of Education. Completion of this 11-month TEAMS program leads to a Middle Grades Endorsement, a Provisional Secondary Teaching Certificate and a Master's Degree (M.Ed.) in Secondary Education with an emphasis in either science or mathematics. The combination of the middle grade endorsement with the secondary teaching certificate makes candidates eligible for teaching science and/or mathematics in grades 5-12.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

TEAMS is a quality program committed to preparing highly trained science and math teachers.

This fast-track (July through May) post-baccalaureate program is based on integration of learning theory, innovative teaching techniques, and technology into classroom instruction and field experiences.

TEAMS includes a set of core courses that all students take as a cohort. These are sequential in nature and build upon each other over the summer, fall, and spring blocks.

The program of instruction includes thirteen courses totaling 39 credit hours to be completed in eleven months.

Students take one methods and one technology course specific to their area of certification.

Most of the faculty is full-time and those that are associate faculty return year after year.

During interviews, a reference to Calculus I, II, and III being a requirement for math candidates surfaced. A reference to this requirement was not found in any of the documents submitted for review.

The team found the use of omnibus course numbers for three courses, but all of the courses have been approved and the omnibus numbers have been dropped for '07-'08.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Clarify calculus requirement.

Clarify the list of courses on the website even though it is referred to as “representative only. Course titles do not match those in the catalogue and six of the thirteen courses are identified with the omnibus number SED 598.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Website
- Syllabi
- Interview with Director
- Interview with Institution Administration
- Interview with instructors
- Interview with graduates)
- Interview with students
- Interview with supervising teachers
- Interview with employers of graduates

If Unmet, further action required:

Replace omnibus numbers (SED 598) with unique coursework identifiers. Submit revised program sequence with unique coursework numbers to ADE within 30 days of State Board approval.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Assignments, timelines, grading scales and student responsibilities are clearly delineated.

Course goals/objectives and competencies are aligned with assessments and state standards in most syllabi. However, alignment to state standards is at various levels (some at standard level, but not at the indicator level).

Syllabi made no reference to national standards.

Classroom management is part of the curriculum in three courses within the program, but not one specific course.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Reflect the strong integration of coursework within the field experience component in the course syllabi. Course assignments are often implemented within the field experience, but there is no mention of this in the course descriptions. In most of the courses requiring a field experience, there is also no reference to the necessity of being registered concurrently in field experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Website
- Syllabi
- Interview with Director

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise all syllabi to clearly indicate an alignment of state and national standards at the standard and performance indicator levels for topics/objectives and competencies.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Benchmark assignments were generally clearly delineated.

The benchmark assignments were carefully chosen to provide evidence of a candidate's competency in meeting standards.

Discrepancies were noted by the review team between the benchmark assignments in the syllabi and the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi
- Course catalogue

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and revise, if necessary, syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard-based language.

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

No rubrics were found

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Design rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements for each benchmark assignment.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of rubrics.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There is a very strong emphasis on field experiences and data-driven decision making.

Two field experiences of approximately 9 weeks in length are required, one in middle school and the other in high school.

The middle school and high school field experiences provide a firm foundation for the student teaching experience.

The strong relationship with Chandler has allowed for individual-specific placements for field experiences and student teaching.

The field experience assignments are closely aligned with the standards and coursework. All but three of the required courses in the program require experience in a classroom and have designed coursework for the students to complete during the field experience.

During field experiences, candidates are placed with exemplary mentors. Both the students and director remarked about the exceptional math and science teachers who have been identified as mentors for the TEAMS interns.

Rigorous standards-based coursework is provided by highly knowledgeable and experienced instructors.

The university supervisors monitor students closely in their field experiences.

The majority of the field experience placements are made through the partnership with Chandler, which has a large technology infrastructure.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Continue with the plan to design a TEAMS mentor handbook that will provide mentors with the information they need specific to the timelines and requirements of this program.

Follow through with current plans to expand the program to other districts to increase opportunities for placement of students and increase the diversity component of available placements.

Identify the connection between the field experience and the coursework within the course information documents.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 documentation
- Website
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Interview with Director
- Interview with mentor teacher

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics specific to course-based field experiences were not available.

Intern evaluations are not aligned with state or national standards.

Field experience assessments include reflective journals, field assignments, clinical interviews and mid-term and final evaluations.

Candidates' growth and development is closely monitored by the mentor teacher and the university supervisor using the evaluation instruments.

The program director meets with each student one-on-one to go over the final evaluation for each of the two field experiences.

When concerns arise about a candidate, they are dealt with directly by the director, the mentor teacher and the student. The university is fully prepared to help in such cases, but it has not been necessary to date. A few candidates have been counseled into other programs.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Modify the field experience evaluation instruments to include specific benchmark assignments from the methods coursework.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 Documentation
- Syllabi
- Intern and Mentor Handbooks
- Interview with director

If Unmet, further action required:

Design rubrics specific to course-based field experiences with clear performance indicators and anchor statements.

Align field experience rubrics to state and national standards at the standard and performance indicator level.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Student teaching is done in the spring semester and includes a research component necessary for the Applied Project.

TEAMS student teaching requirement is 8-credit hours for 400 total clock hours with 140 hours of actual teaching.

Placements are made directly by the director in collaboration with district personnel.

LEA personnel had high praise for the quality student teachers, stating that they were well prepared.

LEA personnel were pleased with the performance of the TEAMS candidates they have hired and they hire as many candidates as available.

Student teachers design and implement an action research project for their Master's degree in Secondary Education. Data is collected for this Applied Project during student teaching.

One graduate of the program remarked that her instructor was fabulous and she was still using the research in her classroom.

The student teaching handbook has been recently revised from the general COE handbook to reflect the different timelines and number of assessments to provide continuity for the university supervisors and less confusion for students.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 Documentation
- Syllabi
- Student Teaching Materials
- Interview with director
- Program Matrix
- Interview with mentor teachers and LEA administrators

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The student teaching evaluation is very thorough and well structured. It is rigorous and aligned to state standards.

Student teachers are evaluated twice by their mentors. The Developing Assessment at the end of the 2nd week and the Final Assessment at the end of the semester.

The university supervisor makes a minimum of five visits to the classroom, three of which are formal observations.

Students must receive a minimum of 81% on the final assessment. The entire 2004 cohort (17 students) and 2005 cohort (15 students) met this requirement.

Student teaching evaluations are not aligned with national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Continue with the plan to design a TEAMS mentor handbook that will provide the mentors with the information they need specific to the timelines and requirements of this program.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Student Teaching Materials
- Interview with director
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Align student teaching evaluation instrument to national standards.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of documents.

PROGRAM MATRIX

The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches through field experience and course work and assesses a candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards. The program matrix must provide evident that supports this alignment.

Findings of the Team:

The TEAMS' Program Matrix clearly identifies the Arizona Academic and INTASC Standards, but course syllabi are not aligned to INTASC standards.

The Program Matrix clearly identifies coursework, field experiences and evidence/artifacts used to assess candidate's competency in meeting standards.

2005 data is presented for each benchmark assignment within each standard.

For example Standard 1:

SED 576 met by 14/14 interns

SED 578 met by 13/16 interns

RDG 507 met by 13/16 interns

SPE 550 met by 14/14 interns

Not all assignments identified in the syllabi match those on the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

In the process of standardizing syllabi within the program be careful to check that the benchmark assignments delineated in those syllabi match those in the program matrix. For example, SED 561.

Check the references to SED 520 for accuracy. The course is listed in Standard 6, but not Standards 5 or 8.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and align where necessary course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and program matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for re-submission of program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The data platform designed for the class of 2005 is excellent.

One year of data was available to the review team.

The Applied Projects reviewed were outstanding.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

In the ongoing evaluation and refinement of the assessments, give special consideration to those assessments that may not directly measure a student's competency in the specific performance objectives within the standards. For example, interviews and surveys in and of themselves may not accurately measure a student's ability to design and plan instruction. On the other hand, an interview assignment could be designed in such a way that it could be an excellent measure of such skills.

Evidence used for decision:

- Step 2 document
- Syllabi
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit data plan for gathering and analyzing assessment data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with state and national standards and indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated Program Matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The program is continually being refined to meet the needs of the students. Feedback from the cohorts has resulted in many refinements to the program. In 2004 the coursework was moved from Chandler to ASU at the Tempe Campus. Substituting in Chandler is no longer mandatory. Also SED 561 was initially a discussion class on research and has been changed to include more technology and is now a blend of research and discovery. To avoid cohort isolation several of the courses in the program were opened to students outside of the program. The constant review and revision of the program based on student and LEA feedback will insure that this very strong program will continuously improve.

Admission requirements are a bachelor's degree, 30 credit hours in science, mathematics or a related field, junior/senior minimum GPA of 2.75, three letters of recommendation and a letter of intent stating the reasons the student wants to participate and the objectives for involvement in the program.

Admission numbers: 2003 – 22 students, 2004 – 17 students, 2005 – 16 students. Twenty-three students are projected for 2007, including seven students with full tuition scholarships as part of the new Project 1000 grant associated with NSF and the ASU Hispanic Center.

Prospective and new students are interviewed by the program director and monitored carefully throughout the program. The outstanding administration of TEAMS is evident in all phases of the program.

This program is certainly doing its part to help meet the COE's goals of Quality – Quantity – Location by addressing the needs of schools that require highly trained science and mathematics teachers.

The new candidates for the program seem to be coming directly from the partnership district through “word of mouth”. So expanding the district pool for field experience and student teaching assignments should prove effective in increasing the candidate pool.

Students participating in a fast-track post-baccalaureate program such as this are highly committed and dedicated. The majority of them have given up lucrative positions in other professions and they demand a quality program. Each and every person associated with the program made it clear that it is a very high quality program that it is extremely successful.

Continue working to provide more field experience placement options with relation to diversity.

The program director is reported by all students to be highly professional, extremely helpful, very supportive and always accessible.

The students interviewed felt that their instructors were “wonderful” and have prepared them well in standards-based instruction, assessment and adolescent development.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Educational Administration and Supervision (supervisor, principal or superintendent)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The program of studies leads to the endorsement of an individual for either a supervisory certificate, principalship certificate or superintendent certificate. The supervisory certificate consists of a minimum of eighteen graduate semester hours of coursework in Educational Administration and Supervision. The principal certificate consists of a minimum of thirty graduate seminar hours of coursework in Educational Administration and Supervision. The superintendent certificate consists of a minimum of thirty-six graduate semester hours of coursework in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assign unique course work number(s)

Findings of the Team:

The Educational Administration and Supervision program submitted to the review team was incomplete. Despite repeated requests for required documentation from the review team and the contact person at ASU, the required documentation was not submitted to the review team until April 23, 2007 by the Department of Educational Administration. This was the second day of the review team site visit. The program sequence submitted on April 23, 2007 was significantly different than the original program sequence submitted on September 15, 2006. New courses and programs of study provided on 4-23-07 provide considerable breadth and depth of important topics and issues for Arizona school administrators and the faculty is to be commended for their work that reflects an emphasis on continued program development. This program review is based upon the program sequence and syllabi submitted on April 23, 2007.

The following courses were submitted to the review team on April 23, 2007:

EDA 520	Diversity
EDA 501	Competency/Performance in Educational Administration
EDA 510	Introduction to Organization & Administration of Public Schools
EDA 525	Human Relations/Societal Factors in Education
EDA 555	Educational Facilities Planning
EDA 573	School Personnel Administration

EDA 591	Policy & Regulation Development *(Omnibus number)
EDA 624	Organizational Development/Management of Schools
EDA 645	Leadership Development for Educational Leaders
EDA 675	Politics of Education
EDA 677	Foundations of Educational Reform
EDA 679	Administration of Special Education Programs

The following courses were submitted to the review team on September 15, 2006:

COE 501	Introduction to Research and Evaluation
COE 505	American Education System
EDA 511	School Law
EDA 526	Instructional Supervision
EDA 576	Principalship
EDA 584	Supervisor Internship
EDA 684	Supervisor Internship
EDA 544	State/Local Finance and Budget
EDA 585	Capstone Seminar: Assessment and Evaluation of School Change

Electives

EDA 548	School, Family and Community Connections
EDA 534	Concepts of Learner-centered Leadership
EDA 515	Administration and Technology in Learning

Course objectives/ topics and competencies, benchmark/signature assignments, and internship requirements must be defined by the roles and responsibilities of each leadership position (principal, supervisor, and superintendent).

Verification of SEI and 3 years of teaching experience was not evident. One student in the cohort is in her first year of teaching and another is a police officer with no teaching experience. The three years of teaching experience is State Board requirement for certification as a supervisor, principal or superintendent.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01(A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01(C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Verify three years teaching experience as admission requirement.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program sequence
- Course syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit process for verification of SEI and 3 years of teaching experience within 30 days of State Board approval.

Re-submit program sequence for Supervisor, Principal and Superintendent programs indicating unique coursework numbers within 30 days of State Board approval.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi did not reflect a standard format.

An incomplete selection of syllabi was submitted to the review team on April 23, 2007. Syllabi were not aligned to ISLLC Standards. Syllabi dates ranged from 2001 to 2007. Over half of the courses submitted on April 23, 2007 were not aligned on the Program Matrix, Section E.

Alignment between identified ISLLC standards, syllabi objectives/competencies, benchmark assignments, rubrics, program matrix, and identified assignments in syllabi was not evident.

The institution is to be commended for the emphasis on LEA partnerships. However, the district adjunct faculty interviewed indicated that candidates selected for the LEA partnership cohort program were based on interest and time commitment, not the capacity of the candidate to become a district administration. One candidate indicated to the review team that she considered the program an opportunity for a 4-year interview since all courses were taught by district administrators.

During a faculty interview, an adjunct professor indicated that the only guidance he was provided by ASU prior to teaching the course was a course description. He further indicated that the LEA was allowed to select district administrators to teach the courses without guidelines from ASU regarding faculty qualifications.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Develop a uniform template for all course syllabi, which clearly identifies course objectives, competencies, benchmark/signature assignments, and corresponding rubrics and requires standard language.

Develop guidelines for adjunct faculty that are used when developing LEA partnerships.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course syllabi
- Program sequence
- Program matrix
- Faculty and candidate interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit all course syllabi indicating alignment to national standards.

Re-submit all course syllabi with clearly identified topics/objectives and competencies.

Re-submit Program matrix to incorporate coursework identified in the April 23, 2007 submission.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Over half of the courses submitted on April 23, 2007 were not aligned on the Program Matrix, Section E.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Student work samples
- Step 2 Program submission
- program matrix, and syllabi review.

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit all coursework with clearly identified benchmark assignments that reflect alignment to the Program Matrix and demonstrate a candidate's competency in meeting national standards.

Re-submit Program matrix to incorporate coursework identified in the April 23, 2007 submission.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Syllabi did not contain rubrics for assessing candidate's competency in meeting national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Include signature assignments and rubrics on syllabi.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix review
- Student work samples.

If Unmet, further action required:

Develop rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements for each benchmark assignment.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

INTERNSHIP

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒ No evidence of alignment

Findings of the Team:

The administrative internship requires two semesters for a total of 270 hours of administrative internship activities in the student's placement.

The administrative internship documentation includes a sign-off sheet that documents hours, a log and calendar that includes date, time, administrative activity, ISLLC standard and hours. In addition there is an internship journal and a portfolio divided by standards. After reviewing several student logs, it was difficult to determine (because of lack of criteria) if the student internship experience was beneficial in providing structured experiences relating to the performance indicator cited. Review team members were unable to align the student portfolio, calendar, log, or journal.

Internship supervision relies heavily on the site mentor. Face to face contact consists of an initial three-way meeting of the university supervisor, site mentor and student before the beginning of the internship to discuss expectations and negotiate the internship contract. If there are no problems with the internship, the ASU supervisor maintains communication throughout the internship through e-mail. A second face-to-face meeting occurs for the final evaluation with the same three participants. According to administration, internship supervision by university personnel is done by two key clinical faculty. Student loads for these faculty members exceed 20 students each semester. Lack of supervision by university faculty, may in fact down play the importance and saliency of this internship experience.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Internship log needs to indicate performance indicators/criteria for each ISLLC standard.

Additional resources need to be provided to hire additional staff personnel to allow for greater supervision and support for students and site mentors during the internship experience.

Evidence used for decision:

- student samples of journal, logs, and calendars

If Unmet, further action required:

Re-submit syllabi and program matrix indicating an alignment between course description, course topics/objectives, course competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR INTERNSHIP

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Internship notebooks are tied to ISLCC standards, but rubrics used to assess candidate notebooks were not provided to the review team. Data analysis concerning student achievement is impossible to determine without accompanying rubrics.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Create template/master syllabi for the Field Experience courses.

Create uniform internship assignments for supervisor, principal and superintendent that reflect the unique roles and responsibilities of each leadership position.

Evidence used for decision:

- Course syllabi
- Student work samples.

If Unmet, further action required:

Create rubrics with clear performance indicators and anchor statements that are aligned to ISLCC standards.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The capstone course changed from EDA 585 to EDA 691 (omnibus). There is evidence in the EDA 691 syllabus provided that the instructors wrote detailed instructions to their students concerning the purpose, objectives and outcomes for this experience. The determination of grades section is not a rubric and there is no indication of ISLLC standards alignment on the syllabus. A grading rubric, not aligned to standards was included with the student work samples and closely mirrors the detailed instructions given to the students.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of capstone syllabi
- Student work samples.

If Unmet, further action required:

Align capstone experience with ISLLC Standards.

Align course description, topics/objectives, competencies, capstone experience and rubric.

Include capstone signature assignment on program matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☐ N/A

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The capstone course changed from EDA 585 to EDA 691. There is evidence in the EDA 691 syllabus provided that the instructors wrote detailed instructions to their students concerning the purpose, objectives and outcomes for this experience. The determination of grades section is not a rubric and there is no indication of ISLLC standards alignment on the syllabus. The grading schema indicated requirements for A and B final grades. An Incomplete will be assigned for work that does not meet the criteria for A or B with the understanding that the student will meet with the instructor to re-do the work for an A or B grade. This is not a gate keeping course, but rather a mastery learning course. A grading rubric was included with the student work samples and closely mirrors the detailed instructions contained in the syllabus. The rubric was not aligned to ISLLC standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604 (C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Provide the grading rubric, aligned to ISLLC standards, to the students with the syllabus and integrate this new capstone experience in the Section E Program matrix. As faculty continue to align and examine these programs, they should examine whether a capstone that operates as a mastery learning project serves the needs of the students and the program.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi
- student samples

If Unmet, further action required:

Align capstone experience with ISLLC Standards.

Align course description, topics/objectives, competencies, capstone experience and rubric.

Include capstone signature assignment on program matrix.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

Based on submission of two programs of studies, the review team was unable to determine program coherence or assess candidate's competency in meeting the national standards. Additionally, none of the syllabi or assignments were aligned to ISLLC standards. After reviewing the syllabi, program matrix and interviewing several faculty members and an administrator, it is apparent that all of these programs are in the process of development and refinement. According to administration, courses with omnibus numbers are in the process of university curriculum approval to obtain unique course numbers. Every faculty member interviewed indicated that the faculty has begun the process of designing master syllabi and aligning course competencies to the ISLLC standards. Signature/benchmark assignments with accompanying rubrics need to be clearly identified in each syllabus noted in the Program Matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Complete the university curriculum approval process for the courses with omnibus numbers.

Finalize the programs of study.

Evidence used for decision:

- Review of syllabi
- program matrix
- interviews with faculty and administrators.

If Unmet, further action required

Review and resubmit the Program Matrix to reflect the program of studies submitted to the review team on April 23, 2007.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of the Program Matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

There is considerable evidence of on-going assessments in the programs but unfortunately these have not yet been aligned to standards.

Data presented does not provide evidence of student achievement on ISLLC standards.

Data presented does not demonstrate candidate's competency on the program of study submitted to the review team on April 23, 2007.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

Data needs to be collected to demonstrate candidate's competency on the program of study submitted to the review team on April 23, 2007.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Program approval until December 31, 2008.**

- The institution must participate in a state-wide task force reviewing administrative program and practicum requirements.
- The institution must provide a plan for resubmission of the administrative program(s) including timelines, proposed programmatic changes, and person responsible. **Date TBD.**

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Eight faculty vita were submitted on 4-23-07. The Educational Administration and Supervision program relies heavily on district personnel, part time instructors, and clinical instructors to deliver their programs to students. Interviews of faculty and part-time faculty members indicate that over half of the courses taught in the five cohorts of students are taught by part time instructors. An exploration of the question as to whether this serves the students and the program well should be part of the ongoing discussion of the department.

A considerable strength of these programs is the school district partnerships that have developed in the Phoenix area. Student interviewed in one of these cohorts indicated high satisfaction with the practical information and assignments that they could immediately use in their school settings. Students also indicated appreciation for instructors who were also key district personnel as they brought a practitioner view point and increased their understandings of their own district.

Internship supervision by university personnel is done by two key clinical faculty. Student loads for these faculty exceed 20 students each semester. More resources need to be provided to hire additional personnel to allow for more supervision and support for students and site mentors.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: School Counseling

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Note: According to the documentation provided, the Community Counseling program is CACREP approved.

According to documentation provided the review team, "the School Counseling option is similar to the community program in that all students must take the same 48 credit hour Professional Core. difference is that school counseling students take an additional 12 hours that include CED 528 (School Counseling), CED 591 (Introduction to Program Evaluation), one course (instead of two) from a list of maladaptive/intervention options, and an additional clinical placement (CED 583; Fieldwork) or internship (CED 680; Internship) in a school setting. Most all of the curriculum is identical across the Community Counseling and School Counseling Programs. The only difference is the added specialty courses for the School Counseling Program."

A new program sequence for School Counseling was submitted to the review team on April 23 2007. This was the second day of the site review.

The following courses did not have unique coursework numbers (CED 591):

- Introduction to Program Evaluation.
- Human Sexuality
- Substance Abuse Counseling
- Counseling Latinos

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

The School Counseling program applies for CACREP approval.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi,
- Programs of study
- Faculty presentation

If Unmet, further action required:

Assign unique course work number for all EDA 598 courses.

A program sequence with unique coursework numbers must be submitted to ADE within 30 days of State Board approval.

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

While syllabi were well developed concerning objectives and competencies, none of the syllabi were aligned to national standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

Align all syllabi to CACREP Standards at the indicator level.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Few syllabi clearly identified the benchmark/signature assignment. It was not possible to determine if a rubric attached to the syllabus corresponded to the signature assignment.

Alignment to program matrix (Section E) was difficult to determine. All benchmark assignments were only identified in the program matrix and were not clearly identified in course work syllabi.

Ten of seventeen required courses were used to identify candidate competencies in the program matrix (section E). Field experience course work was not used to assess candidate's competency in the program matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program files along
- Program matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and resubmit all syllabi to ensure that benchmark/signature assignments are clearly identified using standard language.

Review and revise syllabi to ensure that course descriptions, topics/objectives, competencies and benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences and matrix are aligned.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics were not clearly identified for benchmark assignments. It was impossible for review team members to determine if a rubric attached to a syllabi corresponded to the signature/benchmark assignment.

Rubrics lacked clear performance levels and anchor statements.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s): See further action required.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- program matrix review

If Unmet, further action required:

Design rubrics with clear performance levels and anchor statements for every benchmark/signature assignment.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

PRACTICUM/INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

CED 577, CED 680 and CED 684 provide a continuum of skill development and an increasing level of complexity. The field experiences evaluation instruments clearly reflect the increased levels of expectations. Practicum experiences are well designed and have multiple feedback opportunities.

According to documentation submitted to the review team, candidates must take CED 680 or CED 684 to fulfill Arizona certification requirements.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR PRACTICUM/INTERNSHIP

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Criteria well articulated.

Evaluation instrument needs to be aligned with CACREP Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- syllabi
- evaluation instrument review

If Unmet, further action required:

Align evaluation instruments with CACREP standards.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of documents.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

It was difficult to find alignment between the syllabi and the assignments noted in the program matrices. The program matrix is a critical component of the program review process: these matrices identify how the institution teaches (through field experience and course work) and assess a candidate's competency on state and national standards. In addition, the institution must have evidence that supports this alignment. The program matrix did not provide sufficient evidence of how standards are being addressed related to course work, field work and assessment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

Resubmit course syllabi and program matrices.

See specific program recommendations for timeline for submission of revised program matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Evidence of CACREP accreditation.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

If Unmet, further action required:

College needs to submit all programmatic data for years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-5 or a plan for collecting and analyzing programmatic data within 30 days of program approval by the State Board of Education. Plan needs to provide description of data elements, activities, timelines, and person responsible.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence (program of study)
- Coursework syllabi that align with CACREP Standards and Indicators
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix (Section E) that provides evidence of how CACREP standards are being addressed related to coursework, practicum/internship experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards.
- At least one year of data related to candidate's competency in meeting the CACREP standards based on coursework, practicum/internship experiences identified in the program matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The practicum/internship design and experiences are a strength of this program.

Evaluation and supervision of the practicum/internships are well defined and provide immediate feedback to students.

The Counseling Teaching Clinic provides a valuable service to counseling students, the ASU community and the community at large (half of the clients are ASU and half are from the community).

Students were not available for interview. This is an important voice in the review process and based on the strength of the documentation, a missed opportunity to celebrate a successful program.